

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

**IN RE: NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION
OPIATE LITIGATION**

APPLIES TO:

*County of Summit, Ohio, et al. v. Purdue
Pharma L.P., et al., Case No. 1:18-cv-45090*

MDL 2804

Case No. 17-md-2804

Judge Dan Aaron Polster

**ORDER REGARDING OBJECTIONS
TO REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Magistrate Judge Ruiz issued his Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) regarding Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss on October 5, 2018 for *County of Summit, Ohio, et al. v. Purdue Pharma L.P., et al.*, Case No. 1:18-cv-45090. **Doc. #: 1025**. At the outset, the Parties are reminded that the purpose of filing Written Objections is not to reiterate points or rehash arguments made in briefings on the motions, but to set forth, clearly and concisely, findings in the Magistrate’s R&R that they believe are erroneous or contrary to law, and should include the bases for the objections as well as support from legal authority. Therefore, in the Court’s continued effort to conserve judicial resources, serve the convenience of the parties, and promote the just and efficient conduct of this litigation pursuant to the Court’s and the Parties’ obligation under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

The Court will accept one consolidated filing of Written Objections from each class of defendant identified in footnotes 1-3 of the R&R, and from Plaintiffs. For example, Manufacturer

Defendants shall coordinate to file a single document addressing objections common to all manufacturing defendants, Distributor Defendants shall coordinate to file a single document addressing objections common to all distributor defendants, Pharmacy Defendants shall coordinate to file a single document addressing objections common to all pharmacy defendants, and the PEC shall file a single document addressing objections common to all plaintiffs. Defendants filing Objections to the R&R are directed to collaborate with other co-defendants also filing Objections in order to prevent duplicative arguments on the same issue. For example, Manufacturer, Distributor, and Pharmacy Defendants shall coordinate to avoid objecting to the same issues.

The Court will also accept Responses to the Parties' Objections. All Defendants are directed to coordinate with one another to file a single Response to Plaintiffs' Objections. Plaintiffs are directed to file a single Response that addresses the Objections of all three classes of Defendants (Manufacturer, Distributor, and Pharmacy).

Page limits for the Parties' Written Objections are hereby set to **15 pages** for each class of defendant, and **10 pages** for Plaintiffs. Page limits for the Parties' Responses are set to **10 pages** for both Plaintiffs and Defendants. No motions for relief from the length restrictions will be considered.

Due to the collaboration requirement, the Parties are hereby granted an extension of time to file their Objections and Responses. The Parties' Objections are due not later than **5:00 pm ET** on **Friday, November 2, 2018**. The Parties' Responses are due not later than **5:00 pm ET** on **Monday, November 12, 2018**. No motions for additional extensions of time will be considered.

Except as stated above, all other filing requirements and restrictions remain subject to the Federal Rules, the Local Rules of this District, and the preceding Case Management Orders issued in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Dan Aaron Polster October 10, 2018

DAN AARON POLSTER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE